arXiv:1503.09094v1 [math.PR] 31 Mar 2015

# COMPARISON INEQUALITIES FOR ORDER STATISTICS OF GAUSSIAN ARRAYS

KRZYSZTOF DĘBICKI, ENKELEJD HASHORVA, LANPENG JI, AND CHENGXIU LING

**Abstract:** Normal comparison lemma and Slepian's inequality are essential tools in the study of Gaussian processes. In this paper we extend normal comparison lemma and derive various related comparison inequalities including Slepian's inequality for order statistics of two Gaussian arrays.The derived results can be applied in numerous problems related to the study of the supremum of order statistics of Gaussian processes. In order to illustrate the range of possible applications, we analyze the lower tail behaviour of order statistics of self-similar Gaussian processes and derive mixed Gumbel limit theorems.

**Key Words:** comparison inequality; order statistics process; Slepian's inequality; mixed Gumbel limit theorem; lower tail probability; self-similar Gaussian process; fractional Brownian motion.

## 1. Introduction

The normal comparison inequality is crucial for the study of extremes of Gaussian processes, chi-processes and Gaussian random fields; see, e.g., [3, 4, 15, 18, 25]. It has been shown to be valuable in many other fields of mathematics, such as, for instance, certain problems in number theory; see, e.g., [10, 11]. In the simpler framework of two $d$-dimensional Gaussian distributions $\Phi_{\Sigma^{(1)}}$ and $\Phi_{\Sigma^{(0)}}$ with $N(0,1)$ marginal distributions, the normal comparison inequality gives bounds for the difference

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{u}) := \Phi_{\Sigma^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \Phi_{\Sigma^{(0)}}(\boldsymbol{u}), \quad \forall \boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

by a function of the covariance matrices $\Sigma^{(k)} = (\sigma_{ij}^{(k)})_{d\times d}, k = 0, 1$. As mentioned in [14], the derivation of the bounds for $\Delta(\boldsymbol{u})$, by Slepian [27], Berman [2, 4], Cramér [6], Bickel and Rosenblatt [5] and Piterbarg [24, 25], relies strongly on Plackett's partial differential equation; see [26]. The most elaborated version of the normal comparison inequality is due to Li and Shao [17]. Specifically, Theorem 2.1 therein shows that

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{u}) \le \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \left(\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}) - \arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(0)})\right)_+ \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_j^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij})}\right), \quad \forall \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\rho_{ij} := \max(|\sigma_{ij}^{(0)}|, |\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}|)$ and $x_+ = \max(x, 0)$. Clearly, if $\sigma_{ij}^{(0)} \ge \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}, 1 \le i, j \le d$, then $\Phi_{\Sigma^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{u}) \le \Phi_{\Sigma^{(0)}}(\boldsymbol{u})$, which is the well-known Slepian's inequality derived in [27]. Based on the results of Li and Shao [17], Yan [29] showed that for $\mathcal{N}$ an $N(0,1)$ random variable

$$(1)\ 1 \le \frac{\Phi_{\Sigma^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{u})}{\Phi_{\Sigma^{(0)}}(\boldsymbol{u})} \le \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \frac{e^{-(u_i+u_j)^2/8}}{\mathbb{E}\left\{(\mathcal{N}+(u_i+u_j)/2)_+\right\}} \ln\left(\frac{\pi - 2\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(0)})}{\pi - 2\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(1)})}\right)\right), \quad \boldsymbol{u} \in (0,\infty)^d$$

provided that $0 \le \sigma_{ij}^{(0)} \le \sigma_{ij}^{(1)} \le 1$. Recent extensions of the normal comparison inequalities are presented in [7, 10, 12, 13, 20, 22].

In this paper, we are interested in the derivation of comparison inequalities for order statistics of Gaussian arrays, which are useful in several applications. To fix the notation, we denote by $\mathcal{X} = (X_{ij})_{d\times n}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = (Y_{ij})_{d\times n}$ two random $d \times n$ arrays with $N(0,1)$ components (hereafter referred to as standard Gaussian arrays), and let $\Sigma^{(1)} = (\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)})_{dn\times dn}$ and $\Sigma^{(0)} = (\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})_{dn\times dn}$ be the covariance matrices of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, respectively, with

---

*Date*: April 1, 2015.

$\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk} := \mathbb{E}\{X_{ij}X_{lk}\}$ and $\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk} := \mathbb{E}\{Y_{ij}Y_{lk}\}$. Furthermore, define $\boldsymbol{X}_{(r)} = (X_{1(r)}, \ldots, X_{d(r)}), 1 \le r \le n$ to be the $r$th order statistics vector generated by $\mathcal{X}$ as follows

$$X_{i(1)} = \min_{1\le j\le n} X_{ij} \le \cdots \le X_{i(r)} \le \cdots \le \max_{1\le j\le n} X_{ij} = X_{i(n)}, \quad 1 \le i \le d.$$

Similarly, we write $\boldsymbol{Y}_{(r)} = (Y_{1(r)}, \ldots, Y_{d(r)})$ which is generated by $\mathcal{Y}$.

Our principal results, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.4 derive bounds for the difference

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) := \mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{(r)} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{Y}_{(r)} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right\}, \quad \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2}$$

A direct application of those bounds concerns the study of supreum of the $r$th order statistics process $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \ge 0\}$ of $\{X_j(t), t \ge 0\}, 1 \le j \le n$ which are independent copies of a centered Gaussian process $\{X(t), t \ge 0\}$. More precisely, $X_{r:n}$ is defined by

$$X_{n:n}(t) = \min_{1\le i\le n} X_i(t) \le \cdots \le X_{r:n}(t) \le \cdots \le \max_{1\le i\le n} X_i(t) = X_{1:n}(t), \quad t \ge 0.$$

Below we call $X_{r:n}$ the $r$th order statistics process generated by $X$; we refer to [7, 8, 9] for the study of the extremes of order statistics processes.

With motivation from Theorem 3.1 in [18], we apply the findings of Theorem 2.1 to show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,1]} B_{r:n,\alpha}(t) \le x\right\} = x^{2p_{r:n,\alpha}/\alpha + o(1)}, \quad x \downarrow 0 \tag{3}$$

holds with some non-negative constant $p_{r:n,\alpha}$, where $B_{r:n,\alpha}$ is the $r$th order statistics process generated by a fractional Brownian motion (fBm) $B_\alpha$ with Hurst index $\alpha/2 \in (0,1)$. Moreover, if $B^{(0)}_\alpha$ is an fBm which is independent of $B_{r:n,\alpha}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left(B_{r:n,\alpha}(t) - B^{(0)}_\alpha(t)\right) \le x\right\} = x^{2q_{r:n,\alpha}/\alpha + o(1)}, \quad x \downarrow 0 \tag{4}$$

holds with some non-negative constant $q_{r:n,\alpha}$. This result is related to the problem of the capture time of a fractional Brownian pursuit; see Theorem 4.1 in [18].

In Proposition 2.5 we derive bounds for the ratio

$$\Theta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) := \frac{\mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{(r)} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right\}}{\mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{Y}_{(r)} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right\}}, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{u} \in [0,\infty)^d,$$

which extend (1). Relying on the findings of Li and Shao [17], results for $\Theta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ can be applied for estimation of $p_{r:n,\alpha}$ and $q_{r:n,\alpha}$ appearing in (3) and (4), respectively; this topic will be investigated in a forthcoming paper.

We organize this paper as follows. In Section 2 we display our main results. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the lower tail probability of order statistics of self-similar Gaussian processes, where Slepian-type inequalities for order statistics processes are also derived. We present the limit theorems for stationary order statistics processes in Section 4. Finally, all the proofs are relegated to Section 5 and Appendix.

## 2. Main Results

We begin this section with deriving some sharp bounds for $\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ defined in (2), which go in line with Li and Shao's [17] normal comparison inequality. For notational simplicity we set below

$$Q_{ij,lk} := \left|\arcsin(\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk}) - \arcsin(\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk})\right|, \quad Q^+_{ij,lk} := (\arcsin(\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk}) - \arcsin(\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk}))_+.$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *If $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are two standard $d \times n$ Gaussian arrays, then for any $1 \le r \le n$ we have*

$$\left|\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})\right| \le \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le d\\1\le j<k\le n}} Q_{ij,ik}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2}{1+\rho_{ij,ik}}\right)+\sum_{\substack{1\le i<l\le d\\1\le j,k\le n}} Q_{ij,lk}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij,lk})}\right)\right),\ \forall \boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5}$$

*where $\rho_{ij,lk} := \max(|\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk}|, |\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk}|)$. If further*

$$\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,ik} = \sigma^{(0)}_{ij,ik}, \quad 1 \le i \le d,\ 1 \le j,k \le n, \tag{6}$$

*then*

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \le \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{\substack{1\le i<l\le d\\1\le j,k\le n}} Q^+_{ij,lk}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij,lk})}\right), \quad \forall \boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{7}$$

**Remark 2.2.** *a) For $r = 1$ and $r = n$ the claims in (5) have been obtained in [7], Lemma 4.1. In fact, using in addition similar arguments as in Theorem 1.2 in [25], one can establish for any $[\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}] \subset [-\infty, \infty]^d$ the following comparison inequality*

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{(r)} \in [\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}]\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{Y}_{(r)} \in [\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}]\right\}\right|\\ &\quad\le \frac{1}{\pi}\left(\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le d\\1\le j<k\le n}} Q_{ij,ik}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2}{1+\rho_{ij,ik}}\right)+\sum_{\substack{1\le i<l\le d\\1\le j,k\le n}} Q_{ij,lk}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij,lk})}\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

*with $u_i = \min(|a_i|, |b_i|), 1 \le i \le d$.*
*b) If $u_i \ge 0, 1 \le i \le d$ are all large enough, then*

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \le \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le d\\1\le j<k\le n}} Q^+_{ij,ik}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2}{1+\rho_{ij,ik}}\right)+\sum_{\substack{1\le i<l\le d\\1\le j,k\le n}} Q^+_{ij,lk}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij,lk})}\right)\right). \tag{8}$$

*The proof of (8) is presented in the Appendix.*
A direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 is the following Slepian's inequality for the order statistics of Gaussian arrays.

**Corollary 2.3.** *If (6) is satisfied and further*

$$\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk} \ge \sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk}, \quad 1 \le i < l \le d, 1 \le j,k \le n$$

*holds, then $\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \le 0$, or equivalently*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\cup_{i=1}^d \left\{X_{i(r)} > u_i\right\}\Big\} \ge \mathbb{P}\Big\{\cup_{i=1}^d \left\{Y_{i(r)} > u_i\right\}\Big\}, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{9}$$

Note that the bounds in Theorem 2.1 do not include $r$, which indicates that in some case they may be not sharp. Below we present a sharper result which holds under the assumption that the columns of both $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are mutually independent, i.e.,

$$\sigma^{(\kappa)}_{ij,lk} = \sigma^{(\kappa)}_{il}\mathbb{I}\{j = k\}, \quad 1 \le i,l \le d, 1 \le j,k \le n, \kappa = 0,1, \tag{10}$$

with some $\sigma^{(\kappa)}_{il}, 1 \le i,l \le d, \kappa = 0,1$, where $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$ stands for the indicator function. This result is useful for establishing mixed Gumbel limit theorems, see Section 4.

In order to simplify the presentation, we shall define

$$c_{n,r}=\frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!},\ 0\le r\le n,\quad \rho_{il}=\max(|\sigma_{il}^{(0)}|,|\sigma_{il}^{(1)}|),\quad 1\le i,l\le d$$

and

$$A_{il}^{(r)}=\int_{\sigma_{il}^{(0)}}^{\sigma_{il}^{(1)}}\frac{(1+|h|)^{2(n-r)}}{(1-h^2)^{(n-r+1)/2}}\,dh,\quad 1\le i,l\le d,\ 1\le r\le n.$$

**Theorem 2.4.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, if further* (10) *is satisfied, then for any* $\boldsymbol{u}\in(0,\infty)^d$

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})\le\frac{n(c_{n-1,r-1})^2}{(2\pi)^{n-r+1}}u^{-2(n-r)}\sum_{1\le i<l\le d}\left(A_{il}^{(r)}\right)_+\exp\left(-\frac{(n-r+1)u^2}{1+\rho_{il}}\right)\tag{11}$$

*and*

$$\left|\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})\right|\le\frac{n(c_{n-1,r-1})^2}{(2\pi)^{n-r+1}}u^{-2(n-r)}\sum_{1\le i<l\le d}\left|A_{il}^{(r)}\right|\exp\left(-\frac{(n-r+1)u^2}{1+\rho_{il}}\right)$$

*hold with* $u=\min_{1\le i\le d}u_i$.

In the following proposition we derive an upper bound for $\Theta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})$, see related results in [17, 20, 29].

**Proposition 2.5.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, if further* (6) *holds and* $\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)}\ge\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)}\ge0$ *for all* $1\le i<l\le d,1\le j,k\le n$*, then for any* $\boldsymbol{u}\in[0,\infty)^d$

$$1\le\Theta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u})\le\exp\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\substack{1\le i<l\le d\\1\le j,k\le n}}\frac{C_{ij,lk}e^{-(u_i+u_l)^2/8}}{\mathbb{E}\left\{(\mathcal{N}+(u_i+u_l)/2)_+\right\}}\right)\tag{12}$$

*with* $\mathcal{N}$ *an* $N(0,1)$ *random variable and*

$$C_{ij,lk}=\ln\left(\frac{\pi-2\arcsin(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})}{\pi-2\arcsin(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)})}\right),\quad 1\le i<l\le d,1\le j,k\le n.$$

## 3. Lower Tail Probabilities of Order Statistics Processes

The seminal contributions [18, 19] show that the investigation of the lower tail probability of Gaussian processes is of special interest in many applied fields, for example, in the study of real zeros of random polynomials, in the study of fractional Brownian pursuit, and in the study of the first-passage time for the Slepian process. In this section, we aim at extending some results in [18, 19], by considering order statistics processes instead of Gaussian processes.

Our first result is concerned with Slepian's inequality for order statistics processes. In the following $X,Y,Z$ are three independent mean-zero Gausian processes with almost surely (a.s.) continuous sample paths. In accordance with our notation above $X_{r:n},Y_{r:n}$ and $Z_{r:n}$ are the corresponding $r$th order statistics processes. Below, we shall denote by $\sigma_X(s,t)=\mathbb{E}\left\{X(s)X(t)\right\}$ and $\sigma_Y(s,t)=\mathbb{E}\left\{Y(s)Y(t)\right\}$ the covariance functions of $X$ and $Y$, respectively.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If for all* $s,t\ge0$

$$\sigma_X(t,t)=\sigma_Y(t,t)\quad\text{and}\quad\sigma_X(s,t)\le\sigma_Y(s,t),$$

*then for any* $c\ge0$*,* $T>0$ *and* $u\in\mathbb{R}$ *we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(X_{r:n}(t)+cZ(t)\right)>u\right\}\ \ge\ \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(Y_{r:n}(t)+cZ(t)\right)>u\right\}\tag{13}$$

*and*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big(Z_{r:n}(t)+cX(t)\big)>u\right\}\ \geq\ \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big(Z_{r:n}(t)+cY(t)\big)>u\right\}. \tag{14}$$

We shall display the proof of this proposition in Appendix.

**Remark 3.2.** *Similarly to* [18], *as an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.1 for any $c\geq 0$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$ we obtain that*

$$p_r(x):=\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\ln\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\big(X_{r:n}(t)+cZ(t)\big)\leq x\right\}=\sup_{T>0}\frac{1}{T}\ln\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\big(X_{r:n}(t)+cZ(t)\big)\leq x\right\} \tag{15}$$

*exists and $p_r(x), x\in\mathbb{R}$ is left-continuous, provided that $\sigma_X(0,t)\geq 0$ and $\sigma_Z(0,t)\geq 0$ for all $t\geq 0$.*

Next, we present the main result of this section, which gives a lower tail probability for order statistics processes. Let $\{X(t),t\geq 0\}$ be a centered self-similar Gaussian process with a.s. continuous sample paths and index $\alpha/2$ for some $\alpha>0$, i.e.,

$$X(0)=0,\quad \mathbb{E}\left\{X^2(1)\right\}=1,\quad \{X(\lambda t),t\geq 0\}\overset{d}{=}\{\lambda^{\alpha/2}X(t),t\geq 0\},\quad \forall\lambda>0,$$

where $\overset{d}{=}$ denotes equality of the (finite-dimensional) distribution functions. It is well-known that by Lamperti's transformation a dual stationary Gaussian process $\{X^*(t),t\geq 0\}$ can be defined as

$$X^*(t)=e^{-\alpha t/2}X(e^t),\quad t\geq 0.$$

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let $\{X(t),t\geq 0\}$ and $\{Z(t),t\geq 0\}$ be two independent centered self-similar Gaussian processes with continuous sample paths and common self-similarity index $\alpha/2\in(0,\infty)$. Suppose that $\sigma_X(s,t)\geq 0$ and $\sigma_Z(s,t)\geq 0$ for all $s,t\geq 0$, and both $\rho(t):=\mathbb{E}\left\{X^*(t)X^*(0)\right\},\widetilde{\rho}(t):=\mathbb{E}\left\{Z^*(t)Z^*(0)\right\},t\geq 0$ are non-increasing. If further for any $h\in(0,\infty)$ and $\theta\in(0,1)$*

$$a^2_{h,\theta}=\inf_{0<t\leq h}\frac{\rho(\theta t)-\rho(t)}{1-\rho(t)}>0, \tag{16}$$

*then for any $c\geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq 1}\big(X_{r:n}(t)+cZ(t)\big)\leq x\right\}=x^{2\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}/\alpha+o(1)},\quad x\downarrow 0, \tag{17}$$

*where*

$$\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}:=-\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\ln\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\big(X^*_{r:n}(t)+cZ^*(t)\big)\leq 0\right\}$$

*is the Li-Shao type constant.*

**Remark 3.4.** *As discussed in* [19] *two examples of $\{X(t),t\geq 0\}$ that satisfy all conditions of Theorem 3.3 are the standard fBm $B_\alpha$ and the centered Gaussian process $\{X_\beta(t),t\geq 0\},\beta>0$ with*

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{X_\beta(s)X_\beta(t)\right\}=\frac{2^\beta(st)^{(1+\beta)/2}}{(s+t)^\beta},\quad s,t>0.$$

*Moreover, we have that* (3) *holds with $p_{r:n,\alpha}$ given by*

$$p_{r:n,\alpha}=-\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\ln\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}B_{r:n,\alpha}(e^t)\leq 0\right\}.$$

To this end, we discuss a modification of the fractional Brownian pursuit problem considered in [17, 18]. Let $B^{(k)}_\alpha, 0\leq k\leq n$ be independent standard fBms, and define

$$\tau_{r:n,\alpha}=\inf\{t\geq 0: B_{r:n,\alpha}(t)-1=B^{(0)}_\alpha(t)\}, \tag{18}$$

where $\{B_{r:n,\alpha}(t), t \ge 0\}$ is the $r$th order statistics process of $B_\alpha^{(k)}, 1 \le k \le n$. Then $\tau_{r:n,\alpha}$ can be viewed as a capture time in a random pursuit setting. Assume that a fractional Brownian prisoner escapes, running along the path of $B_\alpha^{(0)}$. In his pursuit, there are $n$ independent fractional Brownian policemen running along the paths of $B_\alpha^{(k)}, 1 \le k \le n$, respectively. At the outset, the prisoner is ahead of the policemen by 1 unit of distance. Then, $\tau_{r:n,\alpha}$ represents the capture time when at least $r$ policemen catches the prisoner. As shown in the aforementioned papers the study of the capture time of the fractional Brownian pursuit is related to the analysis of the lower tail probability of order statistics process since

$$\mathbb{P}\{\tau_{r:n,\alpha} > s\} = \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\left(B_{r:n,\alpha}(t) - B_\alpha^{(0)}(t)\right) \le s^{-\alpha/2}\right\}.$$

As an application of Theorem 3.3 we have that (4) holds with

$$q_{r:n,\alpha} = -\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\ln\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(B_{r:n,\alpha}(e^t) - B_\alpha^{(0)}(e^t)\right) \le 0\right\},$$

which leads to the following result.

**Corollary 3.5.** *If $\tau_{r:n,\alpha}$ is defined as in (18), then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\tau_{r:n,\alpha} > s\} = s^{-q_{r:n,\alpha}+o(1)}, \quad s\to\infty.$$

## 4. Limit Theorems of Stationary Order Statistics Processes

In this section we suppose that $\{X_{r:n}(t), t\ge 0\}$ to be the $r$th order statistics process generated by a centered stationary Gaussian process $\{X(t), t\ge 0\}$ with a.s. continuous sample paths, unit variance and correlation function $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$\rho(t) = 1 - |t|^\alpha + o(|t|^\alpha),\ t\to 0 \ \text{ for some } \alpha\in(0,2] \ \text{ and } \ \rho(t)<1,\ \forall t\ne 0. \tag{19}$$

From Theorem 1.1 in [7] or Theorem 2.2 in [9] for any $T>0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) > u\right\} = T\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}c_{n,r}(2\pi)^{-\frac{r}{2}}u^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-r}\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad u\to\infty, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}\in(0,\infty)$ is a positive constant. As a continuation of [7] we establish below a limit theorem $X_{r:n}$.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t\ge 0\}$ be the $r$th order statistics process generated by $X$ as above. Suppose that (19) holds and $\lim_{t\to\infty}\rho(t)\ln t = \gamma\in[0,\infty]$.*
*a) If $\gamma = 0$, then*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\mathbb{P}\left\{a_{r,T}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}X_{r:n}(t) - b_{r,T}\Big)\le x\right\} - \exp\left(-e^{-x}\right)\right| = 0,$$

*where, with $D := (r/2)^{r/2-1/\alpha}c_{n,r}\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}(2\pi)^{-r/2}$*

$$a_{r,T} = \sqrt{2r\ln T}, \quad b_{r,T} = \sqrt{(2/r)\ln T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2r\ln T}}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{r}{2}\right)\ln\ln T + \ln D\right), \quad T>e. \tag{21}$$

*b) If $\gamma=\infty$, and $\alpha\in(0,1]$, $\rho(t)$ is convex for $t\ge 0$ with $\lim_{t\to\infty}\rho(t)=0$ and further $\rho(t)\ln t$ is monotone for large $t$, then with $\Phi(\cdot)$ the df of an $N(0,1)$ random variable,*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho(T)}}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}X_{r:n}(t) - \sqrt{1-\rho(T)}b_{r,T}\Big)\le x\right\} - \Phi(x)\right| = 0.$$

*c) If $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$, then, with $W$ an $N(0,1)$ random variable*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left\{ a_{r,T}\Big( \sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) - b_{r,T}\Big) \le x \right\} - \mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left( -e^{-(x+\gamma-\sqrt{2\gamma r}W)}\right)\right\}\right| = 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is presented in the Appendix.

## 5. Proofs

Hereafter, we write $\overset{d}{=}$ for equality of the distribution functions. A vector $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{dn})$ will also be denoted by

$$\boldsymbol{z} = (\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_d), \text{ with } \boldsymbol{z}_i = (z_{i1}, z_{i2}, \ldots, z_{in}), \quad 1 \le i \le d,$$

where $z_{ij} = z_{(i-1)n+j}, 1 \le i \le d, 1 \le j \le n$. Note that for any $p = (i-1)n+j, q = (l-1)n+k, 1 \le i,l \le d, 1 \le j,k \le n$

$$\{p < q\} = \{i < l, \text{ or } i = l \text{ and } j < k\}.$$

Furthermore, for any $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_i} = dz_1 dz_2 \cdots dz_{i-1} dz_{i+1} \cdots dz_n, \quad 1 \le i \le n,$$

and for $1 \le i < j \le n$

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_i dz_j} = dz_1 dz_2 \cdots dz_{i-1} dz_{i+1} \cdots dz_{j-1} dz_{j+1} \cdots dz_n.$$

**Proof of Theorem** 2.1: We shall first establish (5) by considering $r = 1$, $r = 2$ and $2 < r \le n$ separately. Case $r = 1$. Note that $\mathcal{X} \overset{d}{=} -\mathcal{X}$ for the standard Gaussian array $\mathcal{X}$. It follows from Theorem 2.1 in [20] that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\Delta_{(1)}(\boldsymbol{u})\right| &= \left| \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cup_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{-Y_{ij} < -u_i\}\Big\} - \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cup_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{-X_{ij} < -u_i\}\Big\}\right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{(i-1)n+j<(l-1)n+k} Q_{ij,lk} \exp\left( -\frac{u_i^2 + u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij,lk})}\right)\end{aligned}$$

establishing the proof of $r = 1$.

Next, by a standard approximation procedure we may assume that both $\Sigma^{(1)}$ and $\Sigma^{(0)}$ are positive definite. Let further $\mathcal{Z} = (Z_{ij})_{d\times n}$ be a standard Gaussian array with covariance matrix $\Gamma^h = h\Sigma^{(1)} + (1-h)\Sigma^{(0)} = (\delta^h_{ij,lk})_{dn\times dn}$, where by our notation $\delta^h_{ij,lk} = \mathbb{E}\{Z_{ij}Z_{lk}\}$. Clearly, $\Gamma^h$ is also positive definite for any $h \in [0,1]$. Denote below by $g_h(\boldsymbol{z})$ the probability density function (pdf) of $\mathcal{Z}$. It is known that (see, e.g., [15], p. 82, or [20])

$$\frac{\partial g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial \delta^h_{ij,lk}} = \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{lk}}, \quad 1 \le i,l \le d, 1 \le j,k \le n. \tag{22}$$

Case $r = 2$. Hereafter, we write $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = -\boldsymbol{u}$ and set

$$Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^h) = \mathbb{P}\left\{ \boldsymbol{Z}_{(n-1)} > \boldsymbol{\lambda}\right\} = \int_{\cap_{i=1}^d \cup_{j,j'=1}^n \{z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ij'}>\lambda_i\}} g_h(\boldsymbol{z})\, d\boldsymbol{z}. \tag{23}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{X}_{(2)} \overset{d}{=} -\boldsymbol{X}_{(n-1)}$ we have

$$\Delta_{(2)}(\boldsymbol{u}) = Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^1) - Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^0) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^h)}{\partial h}\, dh. \tag{24}$$

Note that the quantities $Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^h)$ and $g_h(\boldsymbol{z})$ depend on $h$ only through the entries $\delta^h_{ij,lk}$ of $\Gamma^h$. Hence we have by (22)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial Q}{\partial h}(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^h) &= \sum_{(i-1)n+j<(l-1)n+k} \frac{\partial Q(\mathcal{Z};\Gamma^h)}{\partial \delta^h_{ij,lk}} \frac{\partial \delta^h_{ij,lk}}{\partial h}\\ &= \sum_{(i-1)n+j<(l-1)n+k} (\sigma^{(1)}_{ij,lk}-\sigma^{(0)}_{ij,lk})E_{il}(j,k), \qquad (25)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$E_{il}(j,k) := \int_{\cap_{s=1}^d \cup_{t,t'=1}^n \{z_{st}>\lambda_s, z_{st'}>\lambda_s\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{lk}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}, \quad (i-1)n+j<(l-1)n+k.$$

Next, in order to establish (5) we shall show that

$$|E_{il}(j,k)| \le \varphi(\lambda_i,\lambda_l;\delta^h_{ij,lk}), \quad (i-1)n+j<(l-1)n+k, \qquad (26)$$

where $\varphi(\cdot,\cdot;\delta^h_{ij,lk})$ is the pdf of $(Z_{ij},Z_{lk})$, given by

$$\varphi(x,y;\delta^h_{ij,lk}) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-(\delta^h_{ij,lk})^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2-2\delta^h_{ij,lk}xy+y^2}{2\left(1-(\delta^h_{ij,lk})^2\right)}\right), \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}.$$

We consider below two sub-cases: a) $i=l$ and b) $i<l$.

a) Proof of (26) for $i=l$. Letting $A_i' = \cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^d \cup_{t,t'=1}^n \{z_{st}>\lambda_s, z_{st'}>\lambda_s\}, A_i = \cup_{t,t'=1}^n \{z_{it}>\lambda_i, z_{it'}>\lambda_i\}$, we rewrite $E_{ii}(j,k)$ as

$$E_{ii}(j,k) = \int_{A_i'}\int_{A_i} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}, \quad 1\le i\le d,\ 1\le j<k\le n. \qquad (27)$$

Next, we decompose the integral region $A_i$ according to $a_1)$ $z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i$; $a_2)$ $z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i$; $a_3)$ $z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i$; and $a_4)$ $z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i$.

For case $a_1)$ we have

$$\int_{A_i\cap\{z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}, \qquad (28)$$

where $g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)$ denotes a function of $dn-2$ variables formed from $g_h(\boldsymbol{z})$ by putting $z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i$. Similarly, for cases $a_2)$ and $a_3)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A_i\cap\{z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i &= \int_{A_i\cap\{z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i\\ &= -\int_{\cup_{t=1,t\neq j,k}^n\{z_{it}>\lambda_i\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}. \qquad (29)\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for case $a_4)$

$$\int_{A_i\cap\{z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i = \int_{\cup_{t,t'=1,t,t'\neq j,k}^n\{z_{it}>\lambda_i, z_{it'}>\lambda_i\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}.$$

This together with (27)–(29) yields

$$\begin{aligned}E_{ii}(j,k) &= \int_{A_i'}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}-\cup_{t=1,t\neq j,k}^n\{z_{it}>\lambda_i\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}\\ &\quad -\int_{A_i'}\int_{\cup_{t=1,t\neq j,k}^n\{z_{it}>\lambda_i\}-\cup_{t,t'=1,t,t'\neq j,k}^n\{z_{it}>\lambda_i, z_{it'}>\lambda_i\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}\\ &= \varphi(\lambda_i,\lambda_i;\delta^h_{ij,ik})\Big(\mathbb{P}\Big\{(\cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^d\{Z_{s(n-1)}>\lambda_s\})\cap\{\boldsymbol{Z}_i''\in\{w_{i1}''=\infty\}\}\Big|\{Z_{ij}=\lambda_i, Z_{ik}=\lambda_i\}\Big\}\\ &\qquad -\mathbb{P}\Big\{(\cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^d\{Z_{s(n-1)}>\lambda_s\})\cap\{\boldsymbol{Z}_i''\in\{w_{i1}''\le n, w_{i2}''=\infty\}\}\Big|\{Z_{ij}=\lambda_i, Z_{ik}=\lambda_i\}\Big\}\Big), \qquad (30)\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Z}_i''$ is the $(n-2)$-dimensional components of $\boldsymbol{Z}_i$ obtained by deleting $Z_{ij}$ and $Z_{ik}$, and $w_{i1}'', w_{i2}''$ are defined by (recall $\inf\{\emptyset\} = \infty$)

$$w_{i1}'' = \inf\{t : z_{it} > \lambda_i, t \neq j, k\}, \quad w_{i2}'' = \inf\{t : z_{it} > \lambda_i, t \neq j, k, t > w_{i1}''\}. \tag{31}$$

It follows from (30) that (26) holds for $i = l$.

b) Proof of (26) for $i < l$. With $A_{il}'' = \cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^{d} \cup_{t,t'=1}^{n} \{z_{st} > \lambda_s, z_{st'} > \lambda_s\}$, we have (recall $A_i$ in (27))

$$E_{il}(j,k) = \int_{A_{il}''} \int_{A_l} \int_{A_i} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij} \partial z_{lk}} \, d\boldsymbol{z}. \tag{32}$$

Next, we decompose the integral region $A_i$ according to $z_{ij} > \lambda_i$ and $z_{ij} \le \lambda_i$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{A_i \cap \{z_{ij} > \lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij} \partial z_{lk}} \, d\boldsymbol{z}_i + \int_{A_i \cap \{z_{ij} \le \lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij} \partial z_{lk}} \, d\boldsymbol{z}_i \\
&\quad = -\int_{\cup_{t=1,t\neq j}^{n} \{z_{it} > \lambda_i\} - \cup_{t,t'=1,t,t'\neq j}^{n} \{z_{it} > \lambda_i, z_{it'} > \lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial g_h(z_{ij} = \lambda_i)}{\partial z_{lk}} \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}} \\
&\quad = -\int_{\{w_{i1}' \le n, w_{i2}' = \infty\}} \frac{\partial g_h(z_{ij} = \lambda_i)}{\partial z_{lk}} \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $w_{i1}', w_{i2}'$ are defined by (similar notation below for $w_{l1}', w_{l2}'$ with respect to $k$)

$$w_{i1}' = \inf\{t : z_{it} > \lambda_i, t \neq j\}, \quad w_{i2}' = \inf\{t : z_{it} > \lambda_i, t \neq j, t > w_{i1}'\}. \tag{33}$$

Using similar arguments for the integral with region $A_l$, we have by (32)

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{il}(j,k) &= \int_{A_{il}''} \int_{\{w_{i1}' \le n, w_{i2}' = \infty\}} \int_{\{w_{l1}' \le n, w_{l2}' = \infty\}} g_h(z_{ij} = \lambda_i, z_{lk} = \lambda_l) \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_{ij} dz_{lk}} \\
&= \varphi(\lambda_i, \lambda_l; \delta_{ij,lk}^{h}) \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^{d} \{Z_{s(n-1)} > \lambda_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}_i' \in \{w_{i1}' \le n, w_{i2}' = \infty\}) \\
&\qquad \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}_l' \in \{w_{l1}' \le n, w_{l2}' = \infty\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij} = \lambda_i, Z_{lk} = \lambda_l\} \Big\},
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Z}_i'$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}_l'$ are the $(n-1)$-dimensional components of $\boldsymbol{Z}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}_l$ obtained by deleting $Z_{ij}$ and $Z_{lk}$, respectively. Consequently, by (30) and (34) the validity of (26) follows. Next, by combining (24)–(26), the claim in (5) for $r = 2$ follows by the fact that (see [17])

$$\int_0^1 \varphi(\lambda_i, \lambda_l; \delta_{ij,lk}^{h}) \, dh \le \frac{\arcsin(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)}) - \arcsin(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})}{2\pi(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)} - \sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})} \exp\left( -\frac{\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_l^2}{2(1 + \rho_{ij,lk})} \right). \tag{35}$$

Case $2 < r \le n$. Letting $\widetilde{Q}(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h) = \mathbb{P}\left\{ \boldsymbol{Z}_{(n-r+1)} > \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right\}$ we have

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \int_0^1 dh \left( \sum_{(i-1)n+j < (l-1)n+k} (\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)} - \sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)}) \widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k) \right), \tag{36}$$

where

$$\widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k) := \int_{\cap_{s=1}^{d} \cup_{t_1,\ldots,t_r=1}^{n} \{z_{st_1} > \lambda_s, \ldots, z_{st_r} > \lambda_s\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij} \partial z_{lk}} \, d\boldsymbol{z}.$$

With the aid of (35), it suffices to show that

$$\left| \widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k) \right| \le \varphi(\lambda_i, \lambda_l; \delta_{ij,lk}^{h}), \quad (i-1)n + j < (l-1)n + k. \tag{37}$$

Similarly as above, two sub-cases : a) $i = l$ and b) $i < l$ need to be considered separately.

a) Proof of (37) for $i = l$. Similarly to $E_{ii}(j,k)$, we rewrite $\widetilde{E}_{ii}(j,k)$ as

$$\widetilde{E}_{ii}(j,k) = \int_{\widetilde{A}_i'} \int_{\widetilde{A}_i} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij} \partial z_{ik}} \, d\boldsymbol{z}, \tag{38}$$

where $\widetilde{A}'_i = \cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^{d} \cup_{t_1,\ldots,t_r=1}^{n} \{z_{st_1} > \lambda_s, \ldots, z_{st_r} > \lambda_s\}$, $\widetilde{A}_i = \cup_{t_1,\ldots,t_r=1}^{n}\{z_{it_1} > \lambda_i, \ldots, z_{it_r} > \lambda_i\}$.
Next, we decompose the integral region $\widetilde{A}_i$ according to the four cases $a_1$)–$a_4$) as introduced for $A_i$ (see the last two lines right above (28)).
For case $a_1$)

$$\int_{\widetilde{A}_i \cap \{z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i = \int_{\{w''_{i,r-2}\le n\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}, \tag{39}$$

where $w''_{i1}$ is given by (31) and (notation: $w''_{i,t} = w''_{it}$)

$$w''_{it} = \inf\{t_0 \le n : z_{it_0} > \lambda_i, t_0 \neq j, k, t_0 > w''_{i,t-1}\}, \quad 2 \le t \le r,\ 1 \le i \le d.$$

Next, for cases $a_2$) and $a_3$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\widetilde{A}_i \cap \{z_{ij}>\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i &= \int_{\widetilde{A}_i \cap \{z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}>\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i \\ &= -\int_{\{w''_{i,r-1}\le n\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Finally, for case $a_4$)

$$\int_{\widetilde{A}_i \cap \{z_{ij}\le\lambda_i, z_{ik}\le\lambda_i\}} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{ik}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}_i = \int_{\{w''_{ir}\le n\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}_i}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}}.$$

This together with (38)–(40) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{E}_{ii}(j,k) &= \int_{\widetilde{A}'_i}\int_{\{w''_{i,r-2}\le n, w''_{i,r-1}=\infty\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}} \\ &\quad -\int_{\widetilde{A}'_i}\int_{\{w''_{i,r-1}\le n, w''_{ir}=\infty\}} g_h(z_{ij}=\lambda_i, z_{ik}=\lambda_i)\, \frac{d\boldsymbol{z}}{dz_{ij}dz_{ik}} \\ &= \varphi(\lambda_i,\lambda_i;\delta^h_{ij,ik}) \\ &\quad \times \Big(\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^{d} \{Z_{s(n-r+1)} > \lambda_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}''_i \in \{w''_{i,r-2} \le n, w''_{i,r-1} = \infty\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij}=\lambda_i, Z_{ik}=\lambda_i\}\Big\} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cap_{s=1,s\neq i}^{d} \{Z_{s(n-r+1)} > \lambda_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}''_i \in \{w''_{i,r-1} \le n, w''_{i,r} = \infty\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij}=\lambda_i, Z_{ik}=\lambda_i\}\Big\}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

establishing the validity of (37) for $i = l$.
b) Proof of (37) for $i < l$. By $\widetilde{A}''_{il} = \cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^{d} \cup_{t_1,\ldots,t_r=1}^{n} \{z_{st_1} > \lambda_s, \ldots, z_{st_r} > \lambda_s\}$ and $\widetilde{A}_i$ in (38)

$$\widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k) = \int_{\widetilde{A}''_{il}} \int_{\widetilde{A}_i} \int_{\widetilde{A}_l} \frac{\partial^2 g_h(\boldsymbol{z})}{\partial z_{ij}\partial z_{lk}}\, d\boldsymbol{z}. \tag{42}$$

By decomposing the integral regions $\widetilde{A}_i$ and $\widetilde{A}_l$ according to $z_{ij} >, \le \lambda_i$ and $z_{lk} >, \le \lambda_l$, respectively, we obtain by similar arguments as for $E_{il}(j,k)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k) = \varphi(\lambda_i,\lambda_l;\delta^h_{ij,lk})\mathbb{P}\Big\{ &\cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^{d} \{Z_{s(n-r+1)} > \lambda_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_i \in \{w'_{i,r-1} \le n, w'_{ir} = \infty\}) \\ &\cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_l \in \{w'_{l,r-1} \le n, w'_{lr} = \infty\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij}=\lambda_i, Z_{lk}=\lambda_l\}\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $w'_{i1}$ is introduced in (33) and (similar notation for $w'_{lt}$ with respect to $k$)

$$w'_{it} = \inf\{t_0 \le n : z_{it_0} > \lambda_i, t_0 \neq j, t_0 > w'_{i,t-1}\}, \quad 2 \le t \le r,\ 1 \le i \le d.$$

It follows then from (43) that (37) holds. Consequently, the claim in (5) for $2 < r \le n$ follows.
Finally, in view of (6) we see that the indices over the sum in (25) and (36) are simplified to $1 \le i < l \le d, 1 \le j, k \le n$. Then the claim in (7) follows immediately from (34), (35) and (43). This completes the proof. □

**Proof of Theorem** 2.4: It is sufficient to present the proof of (11). In view of Lemma 4.2 in [7], the claim in (11) for $r = 1$ follows from condition (10). We shall present next the proofs for a) $r = 2$ and b) $2 < r \le n$.
a) Proof of (11) for $r = 2$. It follows from (10), (24) and (25) that

$$\Delta_{(2)}(\boldsymbol{u}) = n \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} (\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)}) \int_0^1 E_{il}\, dh, \tag{44}$$

where $E_{il} := E_{il}(1,1)$. Further, by (10) and (34) we have, with $\delta_{il}^h := \delta_{i1,l1}^h$ (recall $\lambda_i := -u_i, 1 \le i \le d$)

$$0 \le \frac{E_{il}}{\varphi(-u_i, -u_l; \delta_{il}^h)} \le \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \boldsymbol{Z}_i' \in \{w_{i1}' \le n, w_{i2}' = \infty\}, \boldsymbol{Z}_l' \in \{w_{l1}' \le n, w_{l2}' = \infty\} \Big\}. \tag{45}$$

Note that hereafter $w_{i1}', w_{i2}'$ and $w_{l1}', w_{l2}'$ are defined as in (33) with respect to $j = k = 1$.
Next, let $(\widetilde{Z}_i, \widetilde{Z}_l)$ be a bivariate standard normal random vector with correlation $\left|\delta_{il}^h\right|$ and $u = \min_{1\le i\le d} u_i > 0$. It follows by Slepian's inequality in [27] and Lemma 2.3 in [23] that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big\{ Z_{ij} < -u_i, Z_{lk} < -u_l \Big\} &\le \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \widetilde{Z}_i < -u_i, \widetilde{Z}_l < -u_l \Big\} \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\Big\{ -\widetilde{Z}_i > u, -\widetilde{Z}_l > u \Big\} \le \frac{(1 + \left|\delta_{il}^h\right|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u; \left|\delta_{il}^h\right|), \quad j, k \le n, \end{aligned}$$

implying thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \boldsymbol{Z}_i' \in \{(w_{i1}', w_{i2}') = (2, \infty)\}, \boldsymbol{Z}_l' \in \{(w_{l1}', w_{l2}') = (2, \infty)\} \Big\} \\ &\quad = \mathbb{P}\Big\{ Z_{i2} > -u_i, Z_{l2} > -u_i \Big\} \prod_{j=3}^n \mathbb{P}\Big\{ Z_{ij} \le -u_i, Z_{lj} \le -u_l \Big\} \le \Big( \frac{(1 + |\delta_{il}^h|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u; |\delta_{il}^h|) \Big)^{n-2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \boldsymbol{Z}_i' \in \{(w_{i1}', w_{i2}') = (3, \infty)\}, \boldsymbol{Z}_l' \in \{(w_{l1}', w_{l2}') = (2, \infty)\} \Big\} \\ &\quad = \mathbb{P}\Big\{ Z_{i2} < -u_i, Z_{l2} > -u_l, Z_{i3} > -u_i, Z_{l3} < -u_l \Big\} \prod_{j=4}^n \mathbb{P}\Big\{ Z_{ij} < -u_i, Z_{lj} < -u_l \Big\} \\ &\quad \le \Big( \frac{(1 + |\delta_{il}^h|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u; |\delta_{il}^h|) \Big)^{n-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we may consider all $(n-1)^2$ cases in (45) for $w_{i1}' = w_{l1}'$ and $w_{i1}' \ne w_{l1}'$. Therefore, using further (4.6) in [17] we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{il} &\le (n-1)^2 \Big( \frac{(1 + |\delta_{il}^h|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u; |\delta_{il}^h|) \Big)^{n-2} \varphi(-u_i, -u_l; \delta_{il}^h) \\ &\le \frac{(n-1)^2}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} u^{-2(n-2)} \frac{(1 + |\delta_{il}^h|)^{2(n-2)}}{(1 - |\delta_{il}^h|^2)^{(n-1)/2}} \exp\left( -\frac{(n-1)u^2}{1 + |\delta_{il}^h|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by (44) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{(2)}(\boldsymbol{u}) &\le n \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} (\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)})_+ \int_0^1 E_{il}\, dh \\ &\le \frac{n(n-1)^2}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} u^{-2(n-2)} \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} (\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)})_+ \exp\left( -\frac{(n-1)u^2}{1 + \rho_{il}} \right) \int_0^1 \frac{(1 + |\delta_{il}^h|)^{2(n-2)}}{(1 - |\delta_{il}^h|^2)^{(n-1)/2}}\, dh \\ &= \frac{n(n-1)^2}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} u^{-2(n-2)} \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} (A_{il}^{(2)})_+ \exp\left( -\frac{(n-1)u^2}{1 + \rho_{il}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows since for $\delta_{il}^h = h(\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)}) + \sigma_{il}^{(0)}$ we have $\rho_{il} = \max(|\sigma_{il}^{(0)}|, |\sigma_{il}^{(1)}|) \geq \delta_{il}^h$ and

$$\int_0^1 \frac{(1+|\delta_{il}^h|)^{2(n-2)}}{(1-|\delta_{il}^h|)^2)^{(n-1)/2}}\, dh = \frac{1}{\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)}} \int_{\sigma_{il}^{(0)}}^{\sigma_{il}^{(1)}} \frac{(1+|h|)^{2(n-2)}}{(1-h^2)^{(n-1)/2}}\, dh. \tag{46}$$

b) Proof of (11) for $2 < r \leq n$. By (10) and (36)

$$\Delta_{(r)}(\boldsymbol{u}) = n \sum_{1 \leq i < l \leq d} (\sigma_{il}^{(1)} - \sigma_{il}^{(0)}) \int_0^1 \widetilde{E}_{il}\, dh,$$

where $\widetilde{E}_{il} := \widetilde{E}_{il}(1,1)$. Clearly, from (43) we have $\widetilde{E}_{il} \geq 0$. Further, similar arguments as for $E_{il}$ (consider the number of $w'_{it} = w'_{ls}, s, t < r$) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widetilde{E}_{il}}{\varphi(-u_i, -u_l; \delta_{il}^h)} &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \boldsymbol{Z}'_i \in \{w'_{i,r-1} \leq n, w'_{ir} = \infty\}, \boldsymbol{Z}'_l \in \{w'_{l,r-1} \leq n, w'_{lr} = \infty\} \Big\} \\ &\leq (c_{n-1,r-1})^2 \Big( \frac{(1+|\delta_{il}^h|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u; |\delta_{il}^h|) \Big)^{n-r}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the claim in (11) for $2 < r \leq n$ follows. We complete the proof. □

**Proof of Proposition** 2.5: The lower bound follows directly from Theorem 2.1. Next we focus on the upper bound. We shall present below the proof for $r = 2$. Hereafter, we adopt the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Further, define

$$f(h) = \exp\left( \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < l \leq d \\ 1 \leq j,k \leq n}} \frac{1}{H\big((u_i+u_l)/2\big)} \mathcal{C}_{ij,lk}^h \right), \quad h \in [0,1],$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{ij,lk}^h = \ln\left( \frac{\pi - 2\arcsin(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})}{\pi - 2\arcsin(\delta_{ij,lk}^h)} \right)$ and $H(x) = \sqrt{2\pi} e^{x^2/2} \mathbb{E}\left\{ (\mathcal{N} + x)_+ \right\}$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is a $N(0,1)$ random variable. It suffices to show that $Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h)/f(h)$ is non-increasing in $h$, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h)/\partial h}{Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h)} \leq \frac{\partial f(h)/\partial h}{f(h)}, \quad h \in [0,1]. \tag{47}$$

Moreover, since

$$\frac{\partial f(h)/\partial h}{f(h)} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < l \leq d \\ 1 \leq j,k \leq n}} \frac{2(\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)} - \sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)})}{\big(\pi - 2\arcsin(\delta_{ij,lk}^h)\big)\sqrt{1 - (\delta_{ij,lk}^h)^2}} \frac{1}{H\big((u_i+u_l)/2\big)} \tag{48}$$

and, by (25)

$$\frac{\partial Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h)}{\partial h} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < l \leq d \\ 1 \leq j,k \leq n}} (\sigma_{ij,lk}^{(1)} - \sigma_{ij,lk}^{(0)}) E_{il}(j,k). \tag{49}$$

Therefore, by (6), it is sufficient to show that

$$E_{il}(j,k) \leq \frac{2Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h)}{\big(\pi - 2\arcsin(\delta_{ij,lk}^h)\big)\sqrt{1 - (\delta_{ij,lk}^h)^2}} \frac{1}{H\big((u_i+u_l)/2\big)}, \quad 1 \leq i < l \leq d, 1 \leq j,k \leq n. \tag{50}$$

From (34) we have (recall $\boldsymbol{u} = -\boldsymbol{\lambda}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_{il}(j,k)}{\varphi(u_i, u_l; \delta_{ij,lk}^h)} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{ \cap_{s=1, s\neq i,l}^d \{Z_{s(n-1)} > \lambda_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_i \in \{w'_{i1} \leq n\}) \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_l \in \{w'_{l1} \leq n\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij} = \lambda_i, Z_{lk} = \lambda_l\} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left\{ \cap_{s=1, s\neq i,l}^d \{Z_{s(2)} < u_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_i \in \{v'_{i1} \leq n\}) \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_l \in \{v'_{l1} \leq n\}) \Big| \{Z_{ij} = u_i, Z_{lk} = u_l\} \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where $v'_{i1}, v'_{l1}$ are defined by

$$v'_{i1} = \inf\{t : z_{it} < u_i, t \neq j\}, \quad v'_{l1} = \inf\{t : z_{lt} < u_l, t \neq k\}.$$

Define next

$$T_{ij} = \frac{(Z_{ij} - u_i) - \delta^h_{ij,lk}(Z_{lk} - u_l)}{1 - (\delta^h_{ij,lk})^2}, \quad T_{lk} = \frac{(Z_{lk} - u_l) - \delta^h_{ij,lk}(Z_{ij} - u_i)}{1 - (\delta^h_{ij,lk})^2}.$$

It follows that the random vectors $\boldsymbol{Z}^*_v = (Z_{vw} - \delta^h_{vw,ij}T_{ij} - \delta^h_{vw,lk}T_{lk}, 1 \le w \le n), 1 \le v(\neq i,l) \le d$, $\boldsymbol{Z}'^*_i = (Z_{it} - \delta^h_{it,ij}T_{ij} - \delta^h_{it,lk}T_{lk}, 1 \le t \neq j \le n)$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}'^*_l = (Z_{lt} - \delta^h_{lt,ij}T_{ij} - \delta^h_{lt,lk}T_{lk}, 1 \le t \neq k \le n)$ are independent of $(Z_{ij}, Z_{lk})$ and thus are independent of $(T_{ij}, T_{lk})$. Thus, by (51) and the fact that $0 \le \delta^h_{ij,lk}<1, (i-1)n + j < (l-1)n + k, h \in [0,1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{il}(j,k)\frac{\mathbb{P}\{T_{ij} < 0, T_{lk} < 0\}}{\varphi(u_i, u_l; \delta^h_{ij,lk})} \\
& \le \mathbb{P}\Big\{\cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^d \{Z^*_{s(2)} < u_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'^*_i \in \{v'_{i1} \le n\}) \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'^*_l \in \{v'_{l1} \le n\}) \cap (T_{ij} < 0) \cap (T_{lk} < 0)\Big\} \\
& \le \mathbb{P}\Big\{ \cap_{s=1,s\neq i,l}^d \{Z_{s(2)} < u_s\} \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_i \in \{v'_{i1} \le n\}) \cap (\boldsymbol{Z}'_l \in \{v'_{l1} \le n\}) \cap (Z_{ij} < u_i) \cap (Z_{lk} < u_l)\Big\} \\
& = Q(\mathcal{Z}; \Gamma^h).
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 in [29]

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\{T_{ij} < 0, T_{lk} < 0\}}{\varphi(u_i, u_l; \delta^h_{ij,lk})} \ge \frac{\pi - 2\arcsin(\delta^h_{ij,lk})}{2}\sqrt{1 - (\delta^h_{ij,lk})^2} H\left(\frac{u_i + u_l}{2}\right),$$

which together with (52) implies (50), hence the proof for $r = 2$ is complete.
For $2 < r \le n$, we need to show that (50) holds for $\widetilde{E}_{il}(j,k)$. This follows by similar arguments as for $r = 2$, using the inequality (43) instead of (34). ☐

**Proof of Theorem** 3.3: First note that by (15) we have that $\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$ defined by (with $Y_{r:n}(t) := X^*_{r:n}(t) + cZ^*(t)$)

$$\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(x) = -\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le T} Y_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

exists and is left-continuous. Next, we show that $\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(x)$ is right-continuous, which will be crucial for our proof. As in Theorem 3.1 (ii) in [19], it suffices to show that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0, m \ge 1, \theta \in (0,1)$ and $h \in (0,\infty)$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le mh} Y_{r:n}(t) \le x + y\right\} \le \Phi^{-m}\left(\frac{-y + x\left(\sqrt{1 + a^2_{h,\theta}} - 1\right)}{a_{h,\theta}}\right)\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le \theta mh} Y_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}. \tag{53}$$

Let therefore $W_k, 1 \le k \le m$ be independent $N(0,1)$ random variables which are further independent of the dual processes $X^*_i, Z^*$, $1 \le i \le n$, and write, for simplicity, $a = a_{h,\theta}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{h,\theta}(x,Y) &:= \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\le k\le m} \sup_{(k-1)h\le t\le kh} \frac{Y_{r:n}(t, aW_k)}{\sqrt{1+a^2}} \le x\right\} \\
&\ge \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\le k\le m} \sup_{(k-1)h\le t\le kh} Y_{r:n}(t) \le x + y\right\}\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\le k\le m} aW_k \le -y + x\big(\sqrt{1+a^2} - 1\big)\right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\le k\le m} \sup_{(k-1)h\le t\le kh} Y_{r:n}(t) \le x + y\right\}\Phi^m\left(\frac{-y + x\big(\sqrt{1+a^2} - 1\big)}{a}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\{Y_{r:n}(t, aW_k), t \in [(k-1)h, kh]\}$ is the $r$th order statistics process generated by $\{Y_i(t) + aW_k, t \in [(k-1)h, kh)\}, 1 \le i \le n$. Furthermore, it follows by (16) and the monotonicity of $\rho(\cdot), \widetilde{\rho}(\cdot)$ that (set $I_k = [(k-1)h, kh)$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathbb{E}\left\{(Y(t)+aW_{[t/h]+1})(Y(s)+aW_{[s/h]+1})\right\}}{1+a^2} - \mathbb{E}\left\{Y(\theta t)Y(\theta s)\right\}\\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1-\rho(|t-s|)}{1+a^2}\left(a^2 - \frac{\rho(\theta|t-s|)-\rho(|t-s|)}{1-\rho(|t-s|)}\right) + c^2\left(\frac{\widetilde{\rho}(|t-s|)}{1+a^2} - \widetilde{\rho}(\theta\,|t-s|)\right), & t,s \in I_k;\\ \frac{\rho(|t-s|)}{1+a^2} - \rho(\theta\,|t-s|) + c^2\left(\frac{\widetilde{\rho}(|t-s|)}{1+a^2} - \widetilde{\rho}(\theta\,|t-s|)\right), & t \in I_k, s \in I_l, k \ne l \end{cases}\\
&\le 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies by Proposition 3.1 that

$$
p_{h,\theta}(x,Y) \le \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\le k\le m}\ \sup_{(k-1)h\le t\le kh} Y_{r:n}(\theta t) \le x\right\}
$$

establishing (53) and thus the continuity of $\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(x)$ follows. In order to complete the proof, it is suffices to show that (set below $\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) := X_{r:n}(t) + cZ(t)$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{2}{\alpha}\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha} &\le \liminf_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 1}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}{\ln(1/x)}\\
&\le \limsup_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 1}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}{\ln(1/x)} \le -\frac{2}{\alpha}\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}. \qquad (54)
\end{aligned}
$$

By the self-similarity of the process $\widetilde{Y}$, for any $x \in (0,1)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 2/\alpha\ln(1/x)} Y_{r:n}(t) \le 0\right\} &= \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{x^{2/\alpha}\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le 0\right\}\\
&\le \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{x^{2/\alpha}\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}\\
&\le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0<t\le 1}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}{\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0<t\le x^{2/\alpha}}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}\\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0<t\le 1}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}{\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0<t\le 1}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le 1\right\}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 3.1 and the fact that $\sigma_X(s,t) \ge 0$ and $\sigma_Z(s,t) \ge 0$ for all $s,t \ge 0$. Consequently, the lower bound in (54) follows since $\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha} = \mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(0)$. Next, we establish the upper bound in (54). It follows that, for $y > 0$ sufficiently small

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{(\alpha/2)h}\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le h} Y_{r:n}(t) \le y\right\}\\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha h/2}\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{e^{-h}\le t\le 1} (t^{-\alpha/2}\widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t)) \le y\right\}\\
&\ge \frac{1}{\alpha h/2}\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{e^{-h}\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le ye^{-\alpha h/2}\right\}\\
&\ge \frac{1}{\alpha h/2}\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le ye^{-\alpha h/2}\right\}\\
&= \frac{\alpha h/2 - \ln y}{\alpha h/2}\,\frac{1}{\ln(1/(ye^{-\alpha h/2}))}\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le ye^{-\alpha h/2}\right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $h \to \infty$ in the above we obtain that

$$\limsup_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{\ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{0\le t\le 1} \widetilde{Y}_{r:n}(t) \le x\right\}}{\ln(1/x)} \le -\frac{2}{\alpha}\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(y) \to -\frac{2}{\alpha}\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}, \quad y \downarrow 0,$$

where the last step follows by the right-continuity of $\mathrm{c}_{r:n,\alpha}(x)$ at 0. Consequently, (54) holds and thus the proof is complete. □

## 6. Appendix

We present next the proof of (8) and then present two lemmas which are used for the proof of Theorem 4.1. We conclude this section with the proof of Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 4.1.

**Proof of** (8)**.** The claim for $r = 1$ follows from Theorem 2.1 in [20]. For $2 \le r \le n$, we see from the proof of Theorem 2.1 that, it suffices to prove that $E_{ii}(j,k) \le 0$ and $\widetilde{E}_{ii}(j,k) \le 0$ hold for all $1 \le i \le d, 1 \le j < k \le n$. From Remark 2.5(3) in [16], we see that all orthant tail dependence parameters of multivariate normal distributions are zero. Therefore we have for instance for $j \ne 1$ and $1 \le i \le d$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{Z}_i'' \in \{w_{i1}'' = \infty\}\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{Z}_i'' \in \{w_{i1}'' = 1, w_{i2}'' = \infty\}\right\}\\ &\quad = \big(1 - 2\mathbb{P}\{Z_{i1} > \lambda_i | Z_{it} \le \lambda_i, t \ne 1, j, k\}\big)\mathbb{P}\{Z_{it} \le \lambda_i, t \ne 1, j, k\} \le 0, \quad \lambda_i \to -\infty.\end{aligned}$$

It follows then by (30) that $E_{ii}(j,k) \le 0$ for sufficiently large $u_i$ (equals $-\lambda_i$). Thus, we complete the proof for $r = 2$. Similar arguments show that $\widetilde{E}_{ii}(j,k) \le 0$ for sufficiently large $u_i$ (recall (41)). Consequently, the claim for $2 < r \le n$ follows. □

For notational simplicity, we set $q = q(u) = u^{-2/\alpha}, u > 0$ and write $[x]$ for the integer part of $x$.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 with* $\gamma = 0$, *then for any* $a, T > 0$

$$\limsup_{u\to\infty} \sum_{j=[T/(aq)]}^{[\varepsilon/\mathbb{P}\{X_{r:n}(0)>u\}]} \mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:n}(aqj) > u \middle| X_{r:n}(0) > u\right\} \to 0, \quad \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \tag{55}$$

**Proof of Lemma** 6.1: By Lemma 2 in [7] (see the proof of (3.20) therein), for sufficiently large $u$

$$p_u(t) := \mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:n}(t) > u \middle| X_{r:n}(0) > u\right\} \le 2\mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:r}(t) > u, X_{r:r}(0) > u \middle| X_{r:r}(0) > u\right\}.$$

Since further $X(t) - \rho(t)X(0)$ is independent of $X(0)$, we have for some constant $K > 0$ (the value of $K$ might change below from line to line)

$$\begin{aligned} p_u(t) &\le 2^{r+1}\left(\mathbb{P}\left\{X(t) > X(0) > u \middle| X(0) > u\right\}\right)^r\\ &\le 2^{r+1}\left(\mathbb{P}\left\{X(t) - \rho(t)X(0) > u(1-\rho(t)), X(0) > u \middle| X(0) > u\right\}\right)^r\\ &= 2^{r+1}\left(1 - \Phi\left(u\sqrt{\frac{1-\rho(t)}{1+\rho(t)}}\right)\right)^r\\ &\le K u^{-r}\left(\frac{1-|\rho(t)|}{1+|\rho(t)|}\right)^{-r/2} \exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\frac{1-|\rho(t)|}{1+|\rho(t)|}\right), \qquad (56)\end{aligned}$$

the last inequality follows by the Mill's ratio inequality $1 - \Phi(x) \le 1/(\sqrt{2\pi}x)\exp\left(-x^2/2\right), x > 0$.

Now we choose a function $g = g(u)$ such that $\lim_{u\to\infty} g(u) = \infty, |\rho(g(u))| = u^{-2}$. Further it follows from $u^{-2}\ln g(u) = o(1)$ that $g(u) \le \exp(\epsilon' u^2)$ for some $0 < \epsilon' < r/2(1-|\rho(T)|)/(1+|\rho(T)|)$ (recall that $|\rho(T)| < 1$;

see [15], p. 86) and sufficiently large $u$. Next, we split the sum in (55) at $aqj = g(u)$. The first term is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=[T/(aq)]}^{[g(u)/(aq)]} \mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:n}(aqj) > u \middle| X_{r:n}(0) > u\right\}\\
&\quad \le K\frac{g(u)}{aq}u^{-r}\left(\frac{1-|\rho(T)|}{1+|\rho(T)|}\right)^{-r/2}\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\frac{1-|\rho(T)|}{1+|\rho(T)|}\right)\\
&\quad \le Ku^{2/\alpha-r}\exp\left(\epsilon' u^2-\frac{ru^2}{2}\frac{1-|\rho(T)|}{1+|\rho(T)|}\right)\to 0, \quad u\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For the remaining term, by Lemma 1 in [7]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=[g(u)/(aq)]}^{[\varepsilon/\mathbb{P}\{X_{r:n}(0)>u\}]} \mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:n}(aqj) > u \middle| X_{r:n}(0) > u\right\}\\
&\quad \le K\frac{\varepsilon}{\mathbb{P}\left\{X_{r:n}(0)>u\right\}}u^{-r}\left(\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}}\right)^{-r/2}\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}}\right)\\
&\quad \le K\varepsilon\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\left(\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}}-1\right)\right)\\
&\quad \le K\varepsilon, \quad u\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the claim follows by taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. □

Next, with the notation as in (20) we set

$$T = T(u) = \frac{1}{c_{n,r}\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}}(2\pi)^{\frac{r}{2}}u^{r-\frac{2}{\alpha}}\exp\left(\frac{ru^2}{2}\right), \quad u>0. \tag{57}$$

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let $T=T(u)$ be defined as in (57) and $a>0, 0<\lambda<1$ be any given constants. Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.1 for any $0\le s_1<\dots<s_p<t_1<\dots<t_{p'}$ in $\{aqj : j\in\mathbb{Z}, 0\le aqj\le T\}$ with $t_1-s_p\ge\lambda T$*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\mathbb{P}\left\{\cap_{i=1}^{p}\{X_{r:n}(s_i)\le u\}, \cap_{j=1}^{p'}\{X_{r:n}(t_j)\le u\}\right\}\\
&-\mathbb{P}\left\{\cap_{i=1}^{p}\{X_{r:n}(s_i)\le u\}\right\}\mathbb{P}\left\{\cap_{j=1}^{p'}\{X_{r:n}(t_j)\le u\}\right\}\Big| \to 0, \quad u\to\infty.
\end{aligned}\tag{58}$$

**Proof of Lemma** 6.2: Denote

$$X_{ij} = X_j(s_i)\mathbb{I}\{i\le p\} + X_j(t_{i-p})\mathbb{I}\{p<i\le p+p'\}, \quad 1\le i\le p+p', \ 1\le j\le n,$$

and $\{Y_{ij}, 1\le i\le p, 1\le j\le n\} \overset{d}{=} \{X_{ij}, 1\le i\le p, 1\le j\le n\}$, independent of $\{Y_{ij}, p+1\le i\le p+p', 1\le j\le n\} \overset{d}{=} \{X_{ij}, p+1\le i\le p+p', 1\le j\le n\}$. Applying Theorem 2.4 with $X_{i(n-r+1)} = X_{r:n}(s_i)\mathbb{I}\{i\le p\} + X_{r:n}(t_{i-p})\mathbb{I}\{p<i\le p+p'\}$ and $Y_{i(n-r+1)} = Y_{r:n}(s_i)\mathbb{I}\{i\le p\} + Y_{r:n}(t_{i-p})\mathbb{I}\{p<i\le p+p'\}$, it follows by similar arguments as for Lemma 8.2.4 in [15] that, the left-hand side of (58) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
&Ku^{-2(r-1)}\left(\frac{T}{q}\right)\sum_{\lambda T\le t_j-s_i\le T}\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{1+|\rho(t_j-s_i)|}\right)\int_0^{|\rho(t_j-s_i)|}\frac{(1+|h|)^{2(r-1)}}{(1-h^2)^{r/2}}\,dh\\
&\le Ku^{-2(r-1)}\left(\frac{T}{q}\right)\sum_{\lambda T\le aqj\le T}|\rho(aqj)|\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{1+|\rho(aqj)|}\right) \quad \text{for } u \text{ large,}
\end{aligned}$$

where $K$ is some constant. The rest of the proof consists of the same arguments as that of Lemma 12.3.1 in [15] using further the following asymptotic relation (recall (57))

$$u^2 = \frac{2}{r}\ln T + \left(\frac{2}{r\alpha}-1\right)\ln\ln T + \ln\left(\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{1-2/(r\alpha)}\frac{(c_{n,r}\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha})^{2/r}}{2\pi}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad u\to\infty,$$

hence the proof is complete. □

Below $W$ is an $N(0,1)$ random variable independent of any other random element involved.

**Proof of Proposition** 3.1: We shall first present the proof of (13) for any finite set $\mathcal{T}_d$ containing $d$ elements such that $\mathcal{T}_d \subset [0,T]$. We write $\mathcal{T}_d = \{t_1, \ldots, t_d\} \subset [0,T]$. Further we define $f(t_i) = \sqrt{\sigma_X(t_i,t_i) + c^2\sigma_Z(t_i,t_i)} = \sqrt{\sigma_Y(t_i,t_i) + c^2\sigma_Z(t_i,t_i)}$ and

$$X_{ij}^* := \frac{X_j(t_i) + cZ(t_i)}{f(t_i)}, \quad Y_{ij}^* := \frac{Y_j(t_i) + cZ(t_i)}{f(t_i)}, \quad 1 \le i \le d,\ 1 \le j \le n.$$

Then $X_{ij}^*$ and $Y_{ij}^*$ are $N(0,1)$ distributed, and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_d}\left(X_{n-r+1:n}(t) + cZ(t)\right) > u\right\} = \mathbb{P}\left\{\cup_{i=1}^d \{X_{i(r)}^* > u_i\}\right\}, \quad u_i := \frac{u}{f(t_i)},\ 1 \le i \le d.$$

Noting that $\{Z(t), t \ge 0\}$ is independent of $\{X(t), t \ge 0\}$ and $\{Y(t), t \ge 0\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{X_{ij}^* X_{ik}^*\right\} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left\{X_j(t_i)X_k(t_i) + c^2Z^2(t_i)\right\}}{(f(t_i))^2}\\ &= \frac{\sigma_X(t_i,t_i)\mathbb{I}\{j=k\} + c^2\sigma_Z(t_i,t_i)}{(f(t_i))^2} = \mathbb{E}\left\{Y_{ij}^* Y_{ik}^*\right\},\ 1 \le i \le d,\ 1 \le j,k \le n\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{X_{ij}^* X_{lk}^*\right\} &= \frac{\sigma_X(t_i,t_l)\mathbb{I}\{j=k\} + c^2\sigma_Z(t_i,t_l)}{f(t_i)f(t_l)}\\ &\le \frac{\sigma_Y(t_i,t_l)\mathbb{I}\{j=k\} + c^2\sigma_Z(t_i,t_l)}{f(t_i)f(t_l)} = \mathbb{E}\left\{Y_{ij}^* Y_{lk}^*\right\}, \quad 1 \le i < l \le d,\ 1 \le j,k \le n.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (9)

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_d}\left(Y_{r:n}(t) + cZ(t)\right) > u\right\} \le \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_d}\left(X_{r:n}(t) + cZ(t)\right) > u\right\}.$$

The passage from $\mathcal{T}_d$ to $[0,T]$ is standard and therefore we omit the details. We thus complete the proof of (13). Next, for (14), we denote instead $f(t_i) = \sqrt{\sigma_Z(t_i,t_i) + c^2\sigma_X(t_i,t_i)} = \sqrt{\sigma_Y(t_i,t_i) + c^2\sigma_Y(t_i,t_i)}$ and

$$X_{ij}^* := \frac{Z_j(t_i) + cX(t_i)}{f(t_i)}, \quad Y_{ij}^* := \frac{Z_j(t_i) + cX(t_i)}{f(t_i)}, \quad 1 \le i \le d,\ 1 \le j \le n.$$

Then the rest of the proof is the same as that for (13). □

**Proof of Theorem** 4.1: a) In view of Theorem 10 in [1], since (20) and Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 hold for the $r$th order statistics process $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \ge 0\}$, we have for $T = T(u)$ defined as in (57)

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T(u)]} X_{r:n}(t) \le u + \frac{x}{ru}\right\} = \exp\left(-e^{-x}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Expressing $u$ in terms of $T$ using (57) we obtain the required claim for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, with $a_{r,T}, b_{r,T}$ given as in (21); the uniform convergence in $x$ follows since all functions (with respect to $x$) are continuous, bounded and increasing.

b) The proof follows from the main arguments of Theorem 3.1 in [21] by showing that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x-\varepsilon) &\le \liminf_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_X(T) \le c_T b_{r,T} + \sqrt{\rho(T)}x\right\}\\ &\le \limsup_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_X(T) \le c_T b_{r,T} + \sqrt{\rho(T)}x\right\} \le \Phi(x+\varepsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $M_X(t) := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t)$ and $c_T := \sqrt{1-\rho(T)}$. We start with the proof of the first inequality. Let $\rho^*(t), t \ge 0$ be a correlation function of a stationary Gaussian process such that $\rho^*(t) = 1 - 2|t|^\alpha + o(|t|^\alpha)$ as $t \to 0$. Then there exists some $t_0 > 0$ such that for $T$ large

$$\rho^*(t)c_T^2 + \rho(T) \le \rho(t), \quad 0 \le t \le t_0. \tag{60}$$

Denote by $\{Y_k(t), t \ge 0\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ independent centered stationary Gaussian processes with a.s. continuous sample paths and common covariance function $\rho^*(\cdot)$, and define $\{Y(t), t \ge 0\}$ by

$$Y(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y_k(t) \mathbb{I}\{t \in [(k-1)t_0, kt_0)\}, \quad t \ge 0. \tag{61}$$

It follows from (60) that for $T$ sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{E}\{X(s)X(t)\} \ge \mathbb{E}\left\{\left(c_T Y(s) + \sqrt{\rho(T)} W\right)\left(c_T Y(t) + \sqrt{\rho(T)} W\right)\right\}, \quad s, t \ge 0.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_X(T) \le c_T b_{r,T} + \sqrt{\rho(T)} x\right\} &\ge \mathbb{P}\left\{c_T M_Y(T) + \sqrt{\rho(T)} W \le c_T b_{r,T} + \sqrt{\rho(T)} x\right\} \\ &\ge \Phi(x - \varepsilon)\left(\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \in [0,t_0]} Y_{r:n}(t) \le b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\}\right)^{[T/t_0]+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $a = \inf_{0 < t \le t_0} (1 - \rho^*(t)) |t|^{\alpha} > 0$, we have by Theorem 1.1 in [7] (see also (20))

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \in [0,t_0]} Y_{r:n}(t) > b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\}}{t_0 c_{n,r} b_{r,T}^{2/\alpha} \left(1 - \Phi(b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)})\right)^r} = 2^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}.$$

Consequently, since $\gamma = \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{T \to \infty} ([T/t_0] + 1) \ln \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \in [0,t_0]} Y_{r:n}(t) \le b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\} \\ &= -\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{T}{t_0} \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \in [0,t_0]} Y_{r:n}(t) > b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\} \\ &= -\lim_{T \to \infty} T c_{n,r} 2^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha} b_{r,T}^{2/\alpha} \left(1 - \Phi(b_{r,T} + \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)})\right)^r \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

establishing the first inequality in (59).

Next, we consider the last inequality in (59). Note that, by the convexity of $\rho(\cdot)$, there is a separable stationary Gaussian process $\{Y(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ with correlation function given by

$$\widetilde{\rho}(t) = \frac{\rho(t) - \rho(T)}{1 - \rho(T)}, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{62}$$

We have

$$M_X(T) {=} c_T M_Y(T) + \sqrt{\rho(T)} W.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_X(T) \le c_T b_{r,T} + \sqrt{\rho(T)} x\right\} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_Y(T) \le b_{r,T} + \frac{\sqrt{\rho(T)}}{c_T}(x - u)\right\} \varphi(u)\, du \\ &\le \Phi(x + \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}\left\{M_Y(T) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\frac{\sqrt{\rho(T)}}{c_T}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

which means that we only need to prove

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{M_Y(T) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\} = 0.$$

To this end, using again the convexity of $\widetilde{\rho}(\cdot)$, we construct a separable stationary Gaussian process $\{Z(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ with the correlation function (recall $\widetilde{\rho}(\cdot)$ in (62))

$$\sigma(t) = \max\left(\widetilde{\rho}(t), \widetilde{\rho}\left(T \exp\left(-\sqrt{\ln T}\right)\right)\right), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{64}$$

Again by Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{M_Y(T) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\} \le \mathbb{P}\left\{M_Z(T) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\}. \tag{65}$$

Now we make a grid as follows. Let $I_1, \dots, I_{[T]}$ be $[T]$ consecutive unit intervals with an interval of length $\delta$ removed from the right-hand side of each one with $\delta \in (0,1)$ given, and

$$\mathcal{G}_T = \left\{k(2\ln T)^{-3/\alpha},\ k \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \cap \left(\cup_{i=1}^{[T]} I_i\right).$$

It follows from Theorem 10 in [1] and Theorem 1.1 in [7] that, $\sup_{t\in[0,T]} Z_{r:n}(t)$ and $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{G}_T} Z_{r:n}(t)$ have the same asymptotic distribution and thus we only need to show that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{G}_T} Z_{r:n}(t) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\} = 0.$$

Let $\{Z'_{r:n}(t), t \ge 0\}$ be generated by $\{Z'(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ which is again a separable stationary process with the correlation function (recall $\sigma(\cdot)$ in (64))

$$\sigma'(t) = \frac{\sigma(t) - \sigma(T)}{1 - \sigma(T)}, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Analogous to the derivation of (63) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{G}_T} Z_{r:n}(t) \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\}\\
&\quad = \mathbb{P}\left\{\sqrt{1-\sigma(T)}\max_{t\in\mathcal{G}_T} Z'_{r:n}(t) + \sqrt{\sigma(T)}W \le b_{r,T} - \varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}\right\}\\
&\quad \le \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\left(\frac{\rho(T)}{\sigma(T)}\right)^{1/2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{t\in\mathcal{G}_T} Z'_{r:n}(t) \le b_{r,T} + \frac{b_{r,T}\sigma(T)}{\sqrt{1-\sigma(T)}(1+\sqrt{1-\sigma(T)})} - \frac{\varepsilon\sqrt{\rho(T)}}{2\sqrt{1-\sigma(T)}}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $T \to \infty$. The proof of it is the same as that of Theorem 3.1 in [21], by using instead Theorem 1.1 in [7] and our Theorem 2.4. Consequently, the last inequality in (59) follows by (63) and (65). We complete the proof for $\gamma = \infty$.

c) Given $\delta \in (0,1)$, take $I_1, \dots, I_{[T]}$ as in b). For $\{Y_k(t), t \ge 0\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ independent copies of $X$ define

$$Y(t) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y_k(t)\mathbb{I}\{t \in [k-1,k)\}, \quad t \ge 0$$

and

$$X_*(t) := \sqrt{1-\rho_*(T)}Y(t) + \sqrt{\rho_*(T)}W, \quad t \in \cup_{k=1}^{[T]} I_k,$$

where $\rho_*(T) = \gamma/\ln T$. The rest of the proof is similar to that as for Theorem 2.1 in [28] by using our Theorem 2.4 instead of Berman's inequality. We omit the details.

Combining all the arguments for the three cases above, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Supported in part from SNSF 200021-140633/1 and the project RARE -318984 (an FP7 Marie Curie IRSES Fellowship). The first author also acknowledges partial support by NCN Grant No 2013/09/B/ST1/01778 (2014-2016).

## References

[1] J.M.P. Albin. On extremal theory for stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 18(1):92–128, 1990.

[2] S.M. Berman. Limit theorems for the maximum term in stationary sequences. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 35:502–516, 1964.

[3] S.M. Berman. Sojourns and extremes of stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 10(1):1–46, 1982.

[4] S.M. Berman. *Sojourns and extremes of stochastic processes*. Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Advanced Books & Software, Pacific Grove, CA, 1992.

[5] P.J. Bickel and M. Rosenblatt. On some global measures of the deviations of density function estimates. *Ann. Statist.*, 1:1071–1095, 1973.

[6] H. Cramér and M.R. Leadbetter. *Stationary and related stochastic processes. Sample function properties and their applications*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1967.

[7] K. Dębicki, E. Hashorva, L. Ji, and C. Ling. Extremes of order statistics of stationary processes. *TEST*, DOI 10.1007/s11749-014-0404-4, 2014.

[8] K. Dębicki, E. Hashorva, L. Ji, and K. Tabiś. Extremes of vector-valued Gaussian processes: Exact asymptotics. *Submitted*, 2014.

[9] K. Dębicki, E. Hashorva, L. Ji, and K. Tabiś. On the probability of conjunctions of stationary Gaussian processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 88:141–148, 2014.

[10] A.J. Harper. Bounds on the suprema of Gaussian processes, and omega results for the sum of a random multiplicative function. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(2):584–616, 2013.

[11] A.J. Harper. A note on the maximum of the Riemann zeta function, and log-correlated random variables. *http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.0677*, 2013.

[12] A.J. Harper. Pickands' constant $h_\alpha$ does not equal 1/ $Gamma(1/\alpha)$, for small $\alpha$. *http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.5505*, 2014.

[13] E. Hashorva and C. Weng. Berman's inequality under random scaling. *Statistics and Its Interface*, 7:339–349, 2014.

[14] M.F. Kratz. Level crossings and other level functionals of stationary Gaussian processes. *Probab. Surv.*, 3:230–288, 2006.

[15] M.R. Leadbetter, G. Lindgren, and H. Rootzén. *Extremes and related properties of random sequences and processes*, volume 11. Springer Verlag, 1983.

[16] H. Li. Orthant tail dependence of multivariate extreme value distributions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 100(1):243–256, 2009.

[17] W.V. Li and Q.-M. Shao. A normal comparison inequality and its applications. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 122(4):494–508, 2002.

[18] W.V. Li and Q.-M. Shao. Lower tail probabilities for Gaussian processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1A):216–242, 2004.

[19] W.V. Li and Q.-M. Shao. Recent developments on lower tail probabilities for Gaussian processes. *COSMOS*, 1(1):95–106, 2005.

[20] D. Lu and X. Wang. Some new normal comparison inequalities related to Gordon's inequality. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 88:133–140, 2014.

[21] Y. Mittal and D. Ylvisaker. Limit distributions for the maxima of stationary Gaussian processes. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 3:1–18, 1975.

[22] D. Monhor. Inequalities for correlated bivariate normal distribution function. *Probab. Engrg. Inform. Sci.*, 27(1):115–123, 2013.

[23] J. Pickands, III. Upcrossing probabilities for stationary Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145:51–73, 1969.

[24] V.I. Piterbarg. On the paper by J. Pickands "Upcrossing probabilities for stationary Gaussian processes". *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Meh.*, 27(5):25–30, 1972.

[25] V.I. Piterbarg. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of Gaussian processes and fields*, volume 148 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.

[26] R.L. Plackett. A reduction formula for normal multivariate integrals. *Biometrika*, 41:351–360, 1954.

[27] D. Slepian. The one-sided barrier problem for Gaussian noise. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 41:463–501, 1962.

[28] Z. Tan, E. Hashorva, and Z. Peng. Asymptotics of maxima of strongly dependent Gaussian processes. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 49(4):1106–1118, 2012.

[29] L. Yan. Comparison inequalities for one sided normal probabilities. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 22(4):827–836, 2009.

Krzysztof Dębicki, Mathematical Institute, University of Wrocław, pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland
*E-mail address*: `Krzysztof.Debicki@math.uni.wroc.pl`

Enkelejd Hashorva, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne,, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
*E-mail address*: `Enkelejd.Hashorva@unil.ch`

Lanpeng Ji, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
*E-mail address*: `Lanpeng.Ji@unil.ch`

Chengxiu Ling, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
*E-mail address*: `Chengxiu.Ling@unil.ch`